



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/929,265	08/14/2001	Willem Marie Julia Marcel Coene	NL000451	9634
24737	7590	02/07/2005	EXAMINER	
PHILIPS INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY & STANDARDS P.O. BOX 3001 BRIARCLIFF MANOR, NY 10510			WAMSLEY, PATRICK G	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2819	

DATE MAILED: 02/07/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/929,265

Applicant(s)

COENE ET AL

Examiner

Patrick G. Wamsley

Art Unit

2819

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 14 August 2001.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-11 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-11 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 14 August 2001 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 08/14/2001.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 1, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, and 10, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Description of examples or preferences is properly set forth in the specification rather than the claims. See M.P.E.P. 2173.05(d). On line 6 of claim 1, line 6 of claim 7, and line 9 of claim 7, applicant has made a reference (“e.g.”) to an example of a particular parameter without clearly defining the intended scope of the claim. On line 2 of page 10, applicant has made a reference (“in particular”) to examples of optical record carriers. Thus, the examiner cannot properly determine the metes and bounds of these claims.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

Claims 1-11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the Admitted Prior Art, hereafter APA, in view of U.S. Patent 6,507,299 to Nuijten, hereafter Nuijten.

APA discloses runlength limited, hereafter RLL, code sequences, having merging bits for DC control. Unlike independent claims 1, 2, 7, 8, 9, and 11, APA does not detect a polarity of an extracted runlength.

In contrast, Nuijten discloses an arrangement for embedding supplemental data in an information signal using sync patterns. Specifically, negative polarity samples are changed into positive polarity samples to create a watermark [col. 4, lines 1-3]. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to have applied Nuijten's teachings to APA. The motivation would have been to provide a watermark in a perceptually invisible manner, as suggested by Nuijten.

For claim 3, Nuijten's supplemental data, a watermark, is intended to be used for copyright protection of stored data.

For claim 4, Nuijten uses a detected bit stream.

For claim 5, APA discloses frame sync words and subcode blocks.

For claim 6, Nuijten's watermark switches off DC control by producing an offset in the demodulated signal.

For claim 10, APA discloses the use of RLL codes in CDs and DVDs.


Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Art Unit: 2819

U.S. Patent 5,949,834 to Laud et al determines signal polarity for positive and negative sync patterns. U.S. Patent 6,219,322 to Kobayashi adds an identification code to user data. U.S. Patent 6,362,754 to Van Dijk et al embeds a secondary channel within a main channel. U.S. Patent 6,731,711 to Jun uses positive and negative sync pattern correlations. U.S. Patent 6,785,401 to Walker describes temporal synchronization for video watermarks. U.S. Patents 6,362,754 to Van Dijk et al, 6,529,147 to Van Dijk et al, 6,639,525 to Coene, and 6,650,257 to Van Dijk et al all appear related to the instant application.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Patrick G. Wamsley whose telephone number is (571) 272-1814. The official facsimile number is (703) 872-9306. An alternate facsimile number, (571) 273-1814, should only be used for unofficial documents.


Patrick G. Wamsley
February 3, 2005